

A king who renounced his honor, nevertheless, his honor is not renounced

OVERVIEW

The אגריפס asks how גמרא was permitted to forgo his honor and give the right of way to a כלה, when there is a rule that מלך על כבודו אין כבודו מחול.

anticipates a difficulty:

אף על גב דלא היה מלך גמור¹ כדמשמע באלו נאמרין² (סוטה דף מא, א) -

Even though אלו נאמרין was not a valid king as is indicated in אגריפס.

That is why we could have said that in this case his כבוד is מחול, since he is not a גמור מלך.

answers:

מכל מקום היו נוהגין בו כבוד כמלך גמור -

Nevertheless they conducted themselves towards him with an **honor** that is appropriate **as if** he were a **valid king**. Therefore since they treated him as royalty he cannot be מחול on his כבוד.

SUMMARY

The rule of מלך שמחל על כבודו אין כבודו מחול applies to any 'king' who is accorded the respect reserved for royalty.

THINKING IT OVER

answered that מלך אין כבודו מחול applies to אגריפס, since they honored him as a king. Would this apply to anyone that is honored as a king or only to someone who actually is an 'active king' (as אגריפס)?

¹ חשמונאים who was a slave of the הורדוס אגריפס המלך.

² The משנה there relates that אגריפס המלך read the תורה on פסוק of לא תוכל לתת עליך. When he reached the פסוק of לא תוכל לתת עליך, which prohibits the Jews from appointing a king who descends from slaves (like אגריפס) [see also אגריפס, his eyes were tearing. This proves that he was not a valid king. The משנה there continues that the חכמים (nevertheless) calmed him by responding וכו' אתה וכו'.